

Subject: RE: 1330 Pico - HPOZ Motion
From: Joel Miller <jmiller@psomas.com>
Date: 2/16/18, 1:52 PM
To: Gerald Gubatan <gerald.gubatan@lacity.org>

Thanks, Gerald. Unfortunately, I probably can't get to this until first thing Tues.

In my opinion, this is what Ken wants to highlight:

the HPOZ adoption materials showed that the main commercial corridors were excluded from the HPOZ by intent, with the recommendation that a less restrictive zoning tool to protect those corridors' overall character be considered at a later date.

My feeling is that what the motion should discuss is: "... the main commercial corridors were excluded from the HPOZ by intent..."

Talking about "...a less restrictive zoning tool to protect those corridors' overall character be considered at a later date..." is not really part of the motion to amend the HPOZ. It's a future action – probably having to do with a community plan update.

So, I think it's appropriate to add the first phrase but not the second to the motion.

Do you agree?

Regards

Joel

Joel B. Miller, AICP, LEED AP
PSOMAS | *Balancing the Natural and Built Environment*

Land Use Entitlements
555 So. Flower Street, Suite 4300
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Direct dial: 213.223.1440
www.psomas.com

From: Gerald Gubatan [mailto:gerald.gubatan@lacity.org]
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 12:36 PM
To: Joel Miller <jmiller@psomas.com>
Subject: Re: 1330 Pico - HPOZ Motion

Joel,

I am sharing feedback from Ken - Would you like to take a stab at another edit to capture his comments?

You had alot of text in the original which I had taken out but you can go back and reinsert any relevant info as needed and feel free to move things around...

Thanks,

Gerald

"Gerald,

Thanks for sharing this draft motion with us. Generally, it looks quite good. Our only concern may be that it reads as though the justification for removing this property from the HPOZ is that the building lacks architectural significance and was built outside the Period of Significance, when in actuality, we felt it was justified to be removed to correct an error made during the adoption. The motion could include language to indicate that a review of the HPOZ adoption materials showed that the main commercial corridors were excluded from the HPOZ by intent, with the recommendation that a less restrictive zoning tool to protect those corridors' overall character be considered at a later date. Hope that's helpful.

Ken"

Gerald G. Gubatan
Senior Planning Deputy
Office of Council Member Gilbert Cedillo
Council District 1
City Hall, Room 460
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Tel: 213.473.7001
gerald.gubatan@lacity.org
<http://cd1.lacity.org/>

On Thu, Feb 15, 2018 at 8:54 AM, Joel Miller <jmiller@psomas.com> wrote:

Gerald,

Please see the enclosed. I didn't change any of the wording, but I think the motion reads better by shifting paragraphs around. I consider this a non-substantive change. If the change means having to go back to the CLA, just ignore my suggestion. Saving time is more important.

Thank you,

Joel

Joel B. Miller, AICP, LEED AP
PSOMAS | Balancing the Natural and Built Environment

Land Use Entitlements
555 So. Flower Street, Suite 4300

Los Angeles, CA 90071
Direct dial: [213.223.1440](tel:213.223.1440)
www.psomas.com<<http://www.psomas.com/>>

From: RICOH_LA27@PSOMAS.COM [mailto:RICOH_LA27@PSOMAS.COM]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 8:50 AM
To: Joel Miller <jmiller@psomas.com>
Subject: Message from "RNP002673CC14ED"

This E-mail was sent from "RNP002673CC14ED" (MP C4504).

Scan Date: 02.15.2018 08:55:51 (-0800) Queries to:
RICOH_LA27@PSOMAS.COM<mailto:RICOH_LA27@PSOMAS.COM>